

1963

Approved For Release 2001/08/28 : CIA-RDP65B00383R000200040128-7 17821

AND ON HUMAN RESOURCES

In their consideration of President Kennedy's persuasive discourse on foreign relations, we hope Utahans did not miss the impact of the speech he might have given but didn't.

Nor should they miss the subtle compliment he paid to Utah and its people.

As the White House had advertised, this swing West was primarily intended to look at and talk about conservation problems and projects. This has been the theme of almost all his addresses along the way.

That he chose to give his major foreign policy address—his first since the ratification of the test ban treaty and his most comprehensive reply to the rightwing critics of America's policy—in the Salt Lake Tabernacle is a tribute to the audience he expected here.

But equally significant were his few words about the real heart of conservation in America—the conservation of human resources.

Utah has been through some trying times with its educational crisis of recent months. Adverse publicity, unjustified but nonetheless real, has spread across the country. It was good to hear the President of the United States tell the Nation that Utah leads America in the percentage of its youth who finish high school and go on to college.

One would hope that the deeper import of this fact was not lost on President Kennedy. He should understand that Utah, despite its economic problems, has managed this record on its own. It has shown that a State with the will and the ideals that he so graciously described as stemming from the first pioneers in these valleys can do the job without Federal help.

But if a sense of complacent satisfaction was all Utahans got from the President's remarks on youth conservation, his effort would have been wasted. Certainly with this recognition of quantitative success we must accept the challenge of achieving far greater qualitative success.

It is not enough merely to send our youngsters to school longer. We must also send them to better schools, under better teachers, with better parental understanding and community support of the problems educators face.

Thanks, Mr. President, for your kind words about Utah. Utahans now face the challenge to make ourselves more worthy of this kind of national recognition.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Sept. 28, 1963]

LEARNING TO LIVE IN A PERILOUS WORLD

President Kennedy lived up to the promise that he would deliver a major address of his western tour in Salt Lake City. While the address did not follow the advance billing of a conservation theme, the broad foreign policy subject had a wider national and even international significance.

It was a good speech, thoughtful and thought provoking. And it was nonpolitical.

Mr. Kennedy's basic theme in his Tabernacle address was the need for Americans to face the realities of a world in which we have responsibilities we cannot dodge, burdens we cannot shirk, and a world in which we must deal with problems so complex and baffling as to defy quick and easy solutions.

It is understandable, the President said, that many Americans should look back with nostalgia to simpler times when we lived in safety and prosperity at a comfortable distance from the rest of the world.

But it is a simple fact, as Mr. Kennedy said, that today "we cannot turn our back on the world outside."

Like it or not, we are part of the world—and in the age of supersonic planes, missiles that can cross the ocean in minutes, and weapons that can erase whole cities, and deadly radioactive clouds that can encircle

the globe—there is just no such thing as isolation for the United States.

The concept of a fortress America is as dead as the dodo.

The question then is how to face the realities of a world in which we are inevitably deeply involved.

Mr. Kennedy said one answer is to realize that we cannot by command remake the world in our own image. We must recognize that each nation is bound to act in terms of its own interest. We must accept the fact there are many complex and baffling problems which defy pat solution—that, as he said, "to adopt a black-and-white, all-or-nothing policy subordinates our interests to our irritations."

We must in fact have a policy of flexibility. While being ever vigilant to protect American security against any threat, we must be ever ready to take steps which lead toward a more peaceful and stable world.

This does not mean appeasement. But it also does not mean mere belligerence. It means strength, but it also means reasonableness and responsibility.

Fundamentally this is the policy this Nation has been following ever since World War II, under three different administrations, both Democratic and Republican.

It is a policy we must continue to follow, with broad American public understanding and support.

This is a perilous world. We cannot isolate ourselves from it. We can only live in it if we are prepared to face its complex and baffling problems, realistically and with the kind of rational understanding for which Mr. Kennedy so effectively appealed.

[From the Provo Herald, September 29, 1963]

UTAHANS GET LIFT FROM KENNEDY VISIT

In his concise remarks following President Kennedy's Utah address at the Mormon Tabernacle Thursday night, Senator FRANK E. MOSS told the Chief Executive: "you have given us a real lift tonight."

The comment seemed to pretty well fit the situation. The more than 8,000 persons who jammed the Salt Lake Tabernacle showed by the expressions on their faces that they did indeed get a "lift" from the President's appearance and his address.

There were other thousands outside the tabernacle who lingered to hear the speech as it was broadcast over the Temple Square and who struggled in the crowd for a glimpse of the President.

Crowds swarmed at the airport and hotel for a good look and the route of Mr. Kennedy's motorcade was a sea of faces as men, women and children strained for a good look. Many Central Utahans traveled to Salt Lake City for an "in person" view of the President.

But perhaps the people who received the biggest lift of all were the leaders of the Democratic Party in Utah who were walking on air and felt that the Demo stock went up several notches as a result of the President's visit.

The 1964 election will provide an accurate gauge on this. In 1960 all of Utah's electoral votes went to Richard Nixon, Mr. Kennedy's Republican opponent.

President Kennedy and his party, from all reports, were highly pleased with the Utah appearance and felt the warm reception and huge crowds capped anything else up to this point on the President's 11-State tour.

The visitors themselves couldn't help being impressed with a couple of observations during their memorable night at the Mormon Tabernacle.

One was the respect Utahans have for their own President David O. McKay as did President Kennedy; and the other was the tremendously-moving performance of the Tabernacle Choir which sang "America the Beautiful," "The Star Spangled Banner," and "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," as these selections are seldom sung. The per-

formance drew loud praise from the corps of newsmen accompanying the President.

Yes, the President's visit was a great occasion, from many standpoints. It provided a lift, all right—one which will be long remembered.

WHEAT SALES TO COMMUNIST-BLOC NATIONS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a resolution adopted by the five Northwest State Farmers Union presidents, Edwin Smith, of North Dakota; Leonard Kenfield, of Montana; Edwin Christianson, of Minnesota; Ben Radcliffe, of South Dakota; and Gilbert J. Rohde, of Wisconsin. I am in full accord with the position taken in this resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We believe that since Soviet Russia has become a signatory to the international wheat agreement beginning with the 1963 crop year, that it is reasonable to explore the possibilities of a sale of American wheat for dollars or for gold.

The International Wheat Agreement has been in force since 1949 and up to this time, Soviet Russia had been outside the agreement and has normally been an exporting rather than an importing nation.

We would be favorable to an authorization making it possible for the United States to deal with any nation that is a signatory to the International Wheat Agreement. We consider it a good sign that more and more nations are joining in the orderly marketing of wheat in international trade.

Farmers Union has historically taken the position that as long as there is hunger somewhere in the world, we should seek every way to make our abundant production available to the people.

Barnesman Int'l Sec file
PLOT TO GET OTEPKA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for a long time, the American public has been demanding a thorough investigation of the State Department. Newspapers and private citizens have joined in demanding that this bureaucratic nightmare be cleared out. In effect, there is widespread sentiment that the State Department is in bad need of a purge.

It now appears that a purge of personnel in the State Department is being attempted. Unfortunately, it is the very opposite of what the critics of the State Department had in mind, for it is, in effect, an attempted purge of patriots.

Reports in the press relate that the State Department has filed charges against Mr. Otto Otepka, Chief of the Security Evaluation Division. It seems clear that these charges are based primarily on the offense committed by Mr. Otepka in candidly telling the truth to a Senate committee. In addition, the State Department is reported to have issued directions that employees of the State Department are forbidden any contract with the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee or its staff.

This matter raises the most serious and fundamental questions. In the first place, it appears to be a clear-cut case of retaliation against a Government employee for cooperating with a Senate committee. Congress should tolerate no

such retaliation, for this is an offense not just against the individual, but also against the Congress; and if such action does not now constitute contempt of the Senate which is punishable by imprisonment, it is the business of the Senate to close any loopholes, so that retaliation against any witness before a congressional committee will constitute a criminal offense with an appropriate penalty.

This matter also brings into issue the so-called issue of executive privilege. From what appears in the press, it seems clear that not even the broadest definition of this often misused doctrine could apply in the Otepka case, for no one contends that the so-called privilege can be claimed by other than the President himself. In this instance, it appears that the directive to State Department employees prohibiting contact with the Senate committee did not emanate from the President, but rather from a bureaucrat within the State Department itself.

Mr. President, there are but two aspects of this very serious matter. There are many other serious implications in this case, not the least of which is the security practices, or the lack of them, in the State Department.

I sincerely hope that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate and the Judiciary Committee of the Senate will press its continuing investigation of this matter with vigor and resolve. The entire Senate should support this investigation. State Department's attempted purge of patriots must not be tolerated, and this very attempt is further evidence that a thorough investigation of the entire State Department is in order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks the following:

A newspaper article from the Des Moines Sunday Register of October 6, entitled "How Security Clash Led to Aid's Ouster," over the byline of Mr. Clark Mollenhoff.

A newspaper article from the Chicago Tribune of September 29, entitled "Clash Set Off by State Department's Officer Firing," over the byline of Mr. Willard Edwards.

A newspaper article from the St. Louis Globe Democrat of October 2, entitled "State Department Official Said His Superiors Lied," over the byline of Mr. Edward O'Brien.

A newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star of October 4, 1963, entitled "Otepka Row Widens as Senate Calls Rusk," over the byline of Mr. Earl Voss.

An editorial from the Charleston News and Courier of October 4, entitled "The Otepka Case."

An editorial from the Chicago Tribune entitled "State Department Coverup."

And an editorial from the St. Louis Globe Democrat of October 3, entitled "Plot To Get Otepka."

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, Oct. 6, 1963]
How SECURITY CLASH Led to Aid's OUSTER--
OTEPKA QUESTIONED QUICK CLEARANCE
(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Last June, six security officers walked into the office of State Department Security Evaluator Otto Otepka, seized his records, and the contents of his safe and ousted him from his office.

Otepka, 48, Chief of the Security Evaluation Division, was surprised and shaken by the ordeal of being unceremoniously removed from his responsibilities as a key figure in the State Department security program.

In 1958, the veteran lawyer and career civil servant had received the State Department's meritorious service award.

FALLEN FROM FAVOR

In May 1962 Otepka was given the opportunity for advanced executive training at the National War College.

Why had an official with an outstanding record, and with tremendous responsibility in the administration of the State Department security program, fallen so far from favor with his superiors?

There were no allegations that Otepka was a security risk, or that he had anything in his background to question his fitness to hold the \$16,965-a-year job.

Otepka said last week that he asked John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, for an explanation.

Otepka said Reilly refused to give him a reason.

On June 27, Otepka was called to Reilly's office, where Reilly informed him that he would have a new special assignment—preparing a handbook on security matters.

Otepka was informed that he would be moved from his office, room 3333 in the State Department Building, to a small office, and that he would be provided with secretarial services only upon request through Reilly's office.

ENTERED OFFICE

As Otepka and Reilly walked from Reilly's office to Otepka's office, six security officers joined them and entered Otepka's office. Otepka was asked for the combinations to his safes, and access to all other material in his office.

Reilly and the six officials combed through the records in the office and arranged to change the combinations on Otepka's 14 safes.

After about 20 minutes, Otepka was permitted to leave for a luncheon engagement. When he returned, Otepka found he was barred from his own office.

He went to Reilly's office, asked for an explanation, and requested that he be given access to information in his office that he would need for carrying out the new assignment in writing the security handbook.

Otepka said Reilly declined to discuss the reasons for the action.

Otepka said that Reilly lectured him briefly on "institutional loyalty" to the State Department. Otepka said he replied that "loyalty to country should be first and paramount."

Although Otepka was surprised at the method of removing him from his duties, the sharp friction had been apparent for several months.

In fact, Otepka did not attend the National War College because his own investigation indicated that the move was an effort to get rid of him.

The source of the friction was obvious. Otepka was transferred in 1963 from the Civil Service Commission to the State Department Security Division in the regime of the late R. W. Scott McLeod.

To many Democrats and within some foreign service circles at the State Department, there was a sharp antagonism to any person regarded as having been a part of the McLeod organization.

Otepka, a Government employee since 1936, served as deputy to McLeod, and was part of a small team that had been responsible for instituting tighter security regulations and procedures under the Eisenhower administration. Otepka continued as deputy after McLeod became Ambassador to Ireland, and it was long after McLeod left that Otepka received his meritorious service award.

When the Kennedy administration came into power in 1961, Otepka was dropped from his deputy job to that of chief security evaluator. This was a slight drop in status, although his civil service rating and salary remained on the same level.

The New Frontier had some new views on how the State Department security procedures should be handled. The tighter rules and regulations instituted under the Eisenhower administration were regarded as unreasonably tight. Some officials attacked the preemployment investigations of some personnel as insulting.

Otepka took issue with those who sought to change the security rules. He had a face-to-face disagreement with the Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland.

He also disagreed with Cleveland on several individuals who were named to a panel that was to study security program operations.

Otepka held that the security files of several persons being named to the panel disclosed such questionable activity that they should be given a full FBI investigation, and some should be rejected even before an FBI report.

Cleveland and some other high State Department officials insisted that these men should be named to the panel and Otepka was overruled.

Otepka objected to the State Department's frequent use of emergency security clearance for officials being appointed.

ONLY FIVE TIMES

The law provided for emergency security clearance by the Secretary of State for purposes of speeding through an appointment, and when the Secretary of State wished to take personal responsibility for the naming of some person who was regarded as doubtful by the security division.

In the Eisenhower administration, the emergency security clearance was used only five times in unusual cases, but Secretary of State Dean Rusk has used emergency clearance more than 150 times.

Many of these people were hired without the knowledge of Otepka.

Otepka testified freely on his views before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Called before the Internal Security Committee, he also testified frankly on his views on such widely publicized cases as those of William Wieland and John Steward Service.

He testified that he had opposed the continued employment of both Wieland and Service as unsuitable for employment. He had never made a finding that either was disloyal.

SLATED FOR POST

Otepka's work in back files of the State Department produced much of the information on Wieland's role in Cuba and Wieland's strong support of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro.

When the Kennedy administration came into power, the State Department personnel office had slated Wieland for assignment to a highly sensitive post in Germany.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who had strong feelings about the Wieland case, went

1963

Approved For Release 2001/08/28 : CIA-RDP65B00383R000200040128-7
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17823

to Attorney General Robert Kennedy. Attorney General Kennedy intervened to block the assignment of Wieland to any post considered as sensitive.

Although Wieland has continued in the Department, he has been assigned to paper shuffling jobs. Otepka has been of the opinion that Wieland should be forced to retire. In his testimony, Otepka has been critical of the decisions of superiors.

He also has found himself at odds with some of the higher officials of the State Department as to facts, and this indicated that errors or perjury were involved in the testimony of Otepka or those who gave contradictory testimony.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee asked Otepka if he could support his testimony with documents. Otepka produced memorandums and other information from State Department files to support his story.

SUBCOMMITTEE ENRAGED

The barring of Otepka from his office in what appeared to be retaliation for cooperating with the subcommittee resulted in a congressional effort to question Rusk.

Many subcommittee members—Democrats and Republicans—were enraged with the lack of cooperation from the State Department and the evidence indicating retaliation. However, they said they did not believe Rusk was aware of the details of the problem.

Since early July, Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, has been seeking to arrange a hearing with Rusk.

On September 23, Reilly filed notice of charges against Otepka. He charged that Otepka had given State Department information to unauthorized persons, and named the person as Jay Sourwine, chief counsel for the Internal Security Committee.

BILL OF PARTICULARS

DODD went to New York last Wednesday to serve a bill of particulars on Rusk and to ask for an explanation. Rusk has indicated he will make himself available for questioning this week in a case that has the potential for political explosiveness that would rank it with the Alger Hiss perjury case.

The bill of particulars sent to Rusk charged that there has been a coverup of laxity in the security operations at the State Department, and specifically alleges perjury by some State Department officials.

Also at issue will be the recently issued State Department orders that will require that all State Department officials refuse to talk to Congressmen or the staff members of congressional committees unless there has been notice and approval by the State Department.

This is being lashed in Congress as "an outrageous" interference with the right of Congress to investigate as well as an interference with the right of free speech.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 29, 1963]
CLASH SET OFF BY STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICER
FIRING—OUSTER BLAMED ON AID TO SENATE
INQUIRY

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, September 28.—The charges against a State Department security officer who was notified that he is to be removed from office include an allegation that he revealed a "confidential" report which had been sent to McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to President Kennedy.

This was learned today as developments indicated a head-on clash between the State Department and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee headed by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi.

COOPERATED WITH COMMITTEE

Otto F. Otepka, 48, Chief of the Division of Evaluations in the Department's office of security, is the central figure in this controversy. Charges against him were filed September 23. He was given until October 3

to answer but his attorney, Roger Robb, today obtained a 10-day extension.

EASTLAND noted that the main burden of the charges against Otepka was that he cooperated with the Senate subcommittee investigating operations of the State Department's security office.

"The powers of Congress are at stake," EASTLAND said, "and I intend to protect Mr. Otepka, by every means at my command, against accusations which complain, in effect, that he told the truth when asked to do so by a Senate subcommittee."

"BURN BAG" SEARCHED

The subcommittee will meet early next week to consider procedures to follow in a conflict reminiscent of those of a decade ago when Congress was defied by the executive department in investigations of the loyalty of Federal employees.

The State Department admitted Thursday that a letter of charges had been filed against Otepka. It refused to disclose the nature of the charges and its reluctance was explainable when a reporter obtained a copy of them today.

Much of the evidence, upon which the charges are based, came from surreptitious examination of Otepka's "burn bag," in which he placed security material for destruction.

John F. Reilly, the Department's Assistant Secretary of Security, one of the officials questioned by the subcommittee in its investigation, ordered this classified trash bag secretly searched. It was marked with a red X when taken to the State Department's mail room and turned over to Reilly, who put the little bag in his brief case.

ALL DISCARDS STUDIED

Torn pieces of paper were pasted together. All carbons were studied. One-time typewriter ribbons were examined. On the basis of what was found John Ordway, chief of the personnel operations division, accused Otepka of conduct unbecoming an officer of the State Department.

Last June 18, the charges stated a confidential report to Bundy at the White House, written by William H. Brubeck, Special Assistant to Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Executive Secretary of the State Department, was found in Otepka's burn bag. It was not the original but a duplicator copy and the tops and bottoms of pages of the aforementioned document had been cut off, removing the confidential notation.

OTHER CHARGES LOGGED

This declassification and mutilation of a classified document was in violation of law. Otepka was informed. There was no disclosure of the contents of the report to Bundy but it presumably referred to security conditions in the State Department, the subject of the Senate inquiry.

Otepka was also charged:

1. With furnishing a copy of a classified memorandum concerning eight State Department employees to J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel of the Senate Subcommittee. The memorandum dealt with the loyalty of the employees and its disclosure was a breach of the standard of conduct expected of a State Department officer.

2. With furnishing a copy of a classified memorandum concerning the processing of the appointments of members of the Advisory Committee on International Organizations to a person outside the Department. This was stated to be a violation of former President Truman's 1948 directive holding all records relative to the loyalty of Government employees to be confidential.

3. Declassification of a confidential document addressed to the Security Department from John Noonan, supervisory security specialist on the subject of a security meeting in the Department.

FIND QUESTIONS HE WROTE

4. Declassification of a confidential memorandum addressed to Otepka from Frederick

W. Traband, supervisor of personnel security, on the subject: "Security evaluative services" of two department branches.

5. Declassification of a memorandum to J. M. Barta, international relations officer, concerning procedures for reviewing and disposing of adverse information on employees of international organizations dealing with inter-American affairs.

A carbon found in the burn bag, the letter of charges stated, revealed questions prepared by Otepka to be used by Sourwine, the subcommittee counsel, in the interrogation of Reilly, the deputy assistant secretary for security, when he appeared before the subcommittee. Sourwine asked these questions of Reilly, it was stated.

On June 10, a typewriter ribbon in the bag disclosed a set of 24 questions phrased by Otepka to be used in questioning another State Department official. Sourwine asked 15 of these questions.

EVIDENCE CALLED DYNAMITE

The Otepka case has been a subject of whispered comment in Washington for months. Otepka is regarded as a highly respected veteran of the Security Department, responsible for exposing a number of disloyalty cases in his 10 years in the State Department.

The Senate inquiry on conditions in the Department's security office was instigated months ago. Otepka testified for 6 days in secret hearings and one listening Senator described his evidence as "political dynamite."

Secretary of State Rusk was summoned to testify but put off an appearance by pleading the pressure of other affairs. He finally agreed to appear August 30 but, for reasons not made public, was given an indefinite stay shortly before he was to have testified.

Otepka meanwhile had been put under close surveillance. He retained his title as Chief of the Security Evaluations Office, a \$16,000 post, but was transferred from his office to a cubbyhole. This office was "bugged" and his phone was tapped. The Federal Bureau of Investigation was called in to interrogate him.

A number of State Department officials were questioned by the subcommittee. But others were forbidden by the State Department to testify.

The State Department was reportedly alarmed lest the Senate subcommittee's disclosures should be made public before or during Senate debate on the treaty of Moscow, banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere and underwater.

The letter of charges against Otepka was given to him on the day before the Senate ratified the treaty. He engaged Robb, a Washington attorney, and asserted his determination to fight what he regarded as harassment for performance of his duty.

A congressional statute declares that all civil service employees have the right to give information to Congress and may not be restrained in that right. The Truman directive, issued in the year that the Alger Hiss perjury-espionage case was exposed, appears to conflict with that statute.

The claim of "executive privilege," the right of the President to withhold any information about Government employees in the public interest, has been invoked by the Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 2, 1963]

STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL SAYS HIS SUPERIORS LIED—OTEPKA DENIES GIVING SECRET DATA TO SENATE—FORMER CUBAN POLICY ADVISER'S RECORD INVOLVED

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—Otto F. Otepka, State Department security official who has been threatened with dismissal, charged Tuesday that "my superiors" in the Department gave

October 7

"untrue" testimony about the handling of certain personnel cases to a Senate subcommittee.

Mr. Otepka, who for 10 years held a key position in granting security clearances to State Department officers and employees, said the current charges against him stem from the fact that he had sought to refute the allegedly false statements he felt reflected on his performance.

DENIES CHARGES

In an exclusive interview, Mr. Otepka denied he ever had furnished classified documents or other restricted information to any unauthorized person.

He said he had answered certain questions by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, but only after the subcommittee had initiated its own investigation of State Department security procedures.

He said he had declined to "name names" in the individual personnel cases under study by the subcommittee, but since he was under oath, "I could not and did not deny I had official knowledge of these cases."

The State Department filed 13 charges against Mr. Otepka on September 23 as a preliminary to forcing his dismissal from the Government.

Friends of Mr. Otepka have said the charges amount to an allegation that he cooperated with the Senate subcommittee, which long has been keeping State Department personnel security procedures under review.

In the interview, Mr. Otepka said he intends to fight the charges through Civil Service Commission channels. Several Members of Congress have come to his support, saying the real issue is whether Congress can obtain information from executive departments without inviting reprisals against Government witnesses.

A Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report on October 16, 1962, gave high praise to Mr. Otepka as a personnel security officer.

The report stated that his unfavorable recommendations against William Wieland, a top-ranking State Department official in deciding policy toward Fidel Castro during Castro's rise to power in Cuba, had brought harm to Mr. Otepka's State Department career.

It became evident Tuesday that Mr. Otepka's new troubles arose out of the subcommittee's continued interest in the Wieland and other controversial State Department security cases.

Early this year, the subcommittee began delving into additional State Department personnel cases. As Deputy Security Director and Chief Security Evaluator for the Department, Mr. Otepka was summoned to testify in executive session.

He said Tuesday the three main charges against him now are that he gave classified information to Subcommittee Counsel J. G. Sourwine in violation of a 1948 Presidential order restricting the flow of information to congressional committees.

Mr. Otepka told this newspaper he "did not run to Mr. Sourwine." Upon being asked to testify, he said, "I did so, as I always have, with the Department's permission and guidance and with the knowledge of my superiors."

When Mr. Sourwine's questions got into an area where he had knowledge, Mr. Otepka said, he could not and did not give substantive information on the individual cases.

Later, he said, his superiors in the Department, whom he did not name, also testified, telling the subcommittee that the individual cases in question had never been called to their attention by Mr. Otepka.

TESTIMONY CONFLICTS

"This put their testimony in conflict with mine and with my official knowledge. Their testimony was untrue," Mr. Otepka said.

Since his superiors had used the subcommittee forum to make their statements, Mr. Otepka said, he felt entitled to rebut their statements and present the true facts.

He said the best evidence he could present was documentation which I myself had classified in the first place. He said these documents proved that he brought the disputed cases to his superiors' notice and that they had acknowledged the notices in their own handwriting.

"I have a right to defend myself," he said. "I'm not going to run to my superiors and seek permission to rebut their testimony. That would be a lot of nonsense."

"I'm charged with violating an order when all I did was to defend myself."

For his second subcommittee appearance, Mr. Otepka said, he had dictated to his secretary a rough draft of the points he wished to cover. To this, he attached the documents "which I myself had classified and which I wished to place in the subcommittee record."

He said he gave one copy to Mr. Sourwine and put the other copy in his office safe.

The State Department's charges relate, he said, that the typewritten ribbon which was used by his secretary, was picked out of his "burn bag" for office debris and reconstructed by his superiors. This led to several of the specific counts against him in the charges, he said.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 4, 1963]
OTEPKA ROW WIDENS AS SENATE CALLS RUSK:
(By Earl H. Voges)

The Senate Judiciary Committee has sent Secretary of State Rusk a strongly worded demand to produce witnesses, including Mr. Rusk himself, to discuss security procedures in the State Department.

Senator Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, vice chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Internal Security, made a special trip to New York Wednesday to deliver personally a 10-page memorandum to Mr. Rusk.

The memorandum and covering letter signed by Judiciary Committee Chairman EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, was approved by the committee's members.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and brother of the President, did not dissent from the Judiciary Committee's decision to send the memorandum to Mr. Rusk, according to congressional sources.

MAYOR FLAP BREWING

The personal approach by Senator Dodd to Mr. Rusk followed the State Department's announcement last Friday of charges filed against its chief security evaluator, Otto F. Otepka, which could result in his discharge.

Mr. Otepka is accused of passing classified information on loyalty and security cases in the State Department to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in violation of a 1948 Executive order.

The subcommittee believed it had obtained a commitment from the State Department that there would be no reprisals against employees testifying before the committee.

The Department, according to the understanding of congressional sources, claims its action against Mr. Otepka is not in reprisal for his testimony but a consequence of improper actions, among them mutilating and improperly declassifying information on State Department employees' loyalty.

Mr. Otepka intends to fight the charges through civil service channels and into the courts, if necessary.

The Judiciary Committee has asked Mr. Rusk for a full report on the Otepka case from qualified State Department officials as well as other information on security procedures in the Department.

The Senate subcommittee has heard testimony leading it to believe the State Department

has been lax in protecting the national security.

A recent subcommittee report indicates, for instance, that Mr. Rusk approved more than 150 waivers of security clearances of new employees by mid-1962. One-fourth of these waivers were backdated, the subcommittee was told.

Senators on the Internal Security Subcommittee are also said to be concerned about cases of possible perjury by State Department witnesses who have come before them.

RUSK BREAKS DATES

Secretary Rusk decided several weeks ago that only he himself should testify for the State Department before the committee.

On August 15 members of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs and the Office of Security, where Mr. Otepka has been working, were forbidden to contact the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee without permission.

Mr. Rusk has broken several dates to appear before the subcommittee because of the press of other business. One intervening event was his trip to Moscow in August to sign the partial nuclear test-ban treaty.

Since he received the Judiciary Committee's memorandum, however, Mr. Rusk now is reported by Department officials to have decided other State Department employees may testify before the subcommittee. He still intends to appear himself later, it is reported.

[From the Charleston News and Courier, Oct. 4, 1963]

THE OTEPKA CASE

The persecution of Otto Otepka, Chief of the Evaluation Division of the Office of Security in the U.S. State Department, cries out for public attention.

Determined efforts are being made to drive Mr. Otepka from Government service, apparently because he discussed State Department security risks with the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The subcommittee is reported to have heard testimony that Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs, is appointing persons with questionable security backgrounds. The grave allegation was made that Mr. Cleveland inquired as to whether Alger Hiss, convicted perjurer and symbol of disloyalty to the United States, could be brought back into the State Department.

In view of the fact that persons of proven disloyalty have held high posts in the State Department in years past, the subcommittee has a duty to dig deeply into the new charges.

The immediate task is for Mr. Otepka to be protected against vindictive persons in the State Department. We understand there are portions of the United States Code which clearly assert the right and duty of executive branch officials to confer and exchange information with officials of the legislative branch. A precedent must not be established whereby leftwingers in the State Department can silence or punish loyal Americans who have information of disloyal activities.

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, is the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He has participated in many investigations of security problems. We hope that Senator JOHNSTON will devote his attention to the case of Otto Otepka, and will investigate the grave charge that security risks are being eased back into the State Department.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

THE STATE DEPARTMENT COVERUP

The Senate Judiciary Committee has taken the unprecedented action of dispatching a U.S. Senator to deliver by hand to Secretary

1963

Approved For Release 2001/08/28 : CIA-RDP65B00383R000200040128-7 17825

of State Rusk a letter from the full committee. The letter is described as commanding the Secretary to cease obstructing an investigation of frightening breaches of security within the Department or accept the consequences of public exposure.

The letter was carried to New York City, where Rusk is conferring with the Soviet and British Foreign Ministers, by Senator Thomas J. Donohue, vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Mr. Donohue was accompanied by the subcommittee counsel. The Senator also delivered a covering letter from Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, informing Secretary Rusk that the committee intended to meet the challenge posed by a State Department order forbidding employees to testify.

The Department has brought charges against one officer who did testify before the subcommittee. The witness, Otto F. Otepka, Chief of the Division of Evaluations in the Department's Office of Security, is accused of disclosing to the subcommittee Department reports which were classified as confidential. It is understood that he detailed evidence of suspected disloyalty which appalled Senators.

The Judiciary Committee has notified Secretary Rusk that it will defend Otepka's right to testify under provisions of the United States Code and in conformity with concurrent resolutions of the House and Senate adopted in 1958. Mr. Rusk has responded that he will appear before the committee and present his Department's view.

In its letter to the Secretary, the committee has charged that a high official of the Department gave false testimony to the subcommittee under oath. The whole pattern of interference with the subcommittee's inquiry suggests that the State Department knows that it is culpable and is trying to suppress a scandal which could rock the administration.

This is not the first time that an attempt has been made to push Otepka out of the Department. Two years ago the administration announced that 25 trained security agents were to be hacked out of the Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs for reasons of "economy." Their two chiefs, Otepka and Elmer Hipsley, were to be ditched with them. Because of an uproar in Congress, Otepka was permitted to keep his title, but his duties were limited.

It might be thought that the administration would be eager to expose security risks, to get rid of them, and perhaps to prosecute them. But it is not. The reason for this strange attitude is that President Kennedy, Attorney General Kennedy, and other leaders of the New Frontier are on record as having said that there was little or no danger of internal subversion. In their view, communism was strictly a menace from outside, although these days they are not even acting as if they believed that.

So it is embarrassing to have public servants challenging the official thesis by turning up instances of disloyalty within the administration and imparting the information to a Senate body which has been zealous in exposing subversive infiltration of the Government. What would become of the argument that there is nothing to investigate if another Alger Hiss scandal were brought to light?

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 3, 1963]

PLOT TO GET OTEPKA?

Now it begins to appear there is more behind the effort to oust Otto F. Otepka, State Department security official, than was first suspected when he was accused of giving Department secrets to Congress—as though that could jeopardize the security of the Nation.

Suspicion is strong in Washington that the plot against him goes even beyond the State Department—that the character moving in on Otepka is a more powerful figure in our Government than the Secretary of State—none other than the President's brother, Attorney General Bobby Kennedy.

What's it all about? It's not so much that Mr. Otepka told a Senate subcommittee some things the State Department didn't want Congress to know—especially about William Wieland, a top-ranking State official who did nothing to stop Castro's rise to power in Cuba.

It's more because Mr. Otepka is a career man in Government service of unquestioned loyalty who thinks Congress is entitled to know what's going on, who wants real security methods carried out in every Federal agency.

In his security post, his signature was required on all appointments to the State Department, except for the very top posts filled by the White House.

And Mr. Otepka had been exercising this authority to maintain the security reforms instituted under the Eisenhower administration.

In other words, Mr. Otepka has been a hard-line, anti-Communist State Department official—just like Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office, who has been in constant hot water with her superiors for the same reason.

He has tried to keep strange and curious people out of jobs in the Department for whose security he was responsible.

That is how he has run afoul not only of his own superiors but also of that even higher power who operates in the Justice Department. It's not national secrets but apparently but personnel matters that have got him into trouble.

With Bobby Kennedy trying to move Kennedy people to run things the administration way, Mr. Otepka drew the line at some characters he considered dubious.

The flimsy charges about what he told the Senate subcommittee are reported incidental to getting rid of the State Department security official who guarded the door.

It is not Mr. Otepka and his activities which need investigation. It is the plot of those who have been spying on him and snooping around his "burn bag" and doing other petty things in their efforts to oust him.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which gave him high praise as a personnel security officer only a year ago, should launch such a probe.

PORK BARREL OR ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, periodically throughout the history of our country, the charge has been made that the Federal Government runs a public works pork barrel, squandering millions of dollars on foolish projects.

Most recently Life magazine has done a major, widely circulated "expose" of the Federal public works "pork barrel."

Generally these attacks are pursued with more zeal than knowledge, with more innuendo than facts, and sometimes with more political motivation than concern.

Life magazine punctured its recent pork barrel argument when it attempted to contrast good and bad public works. The article closed with a description of the \$60 million Toledo Bend Dam built by the States of Texas and Louisiana as a huge and economically viable addi-

tion to the productive facilities of their States.

The article continued that by building this fine dam themselves, the States saved the people of the United States from another costly raid on their Treasury.

It is, of course, unreasonable to contend that a project financed by the First State Bank is an economically viable addition to the productive facilities of a community but that the same project, financed by the First National Bank, is a raid on the Treasury.

Yet this strange thesis was the basis of the article.

Texas and Louisiana are to be congratulated for moving ahead with the Toledo Bend Dam. Progressive State administrations are increasingly coming to understand that public works projects trigger economic development and that they can return many times their cost in primary and secondary benefits.

We need more State projects—more State participation in development efforts—to speed our economic growth rate and meet the needs of a growing population, including more business opportunities and employment.

We are moving to make State participation possible in the water and related resources field. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has just held hearings on a bill, S. 1111 by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, to provide aid to the States for water resources planning and to speed cooperative Federal-State planning of major river basins. As the planning job is completed, units of coordinated river basin plans can be undertaken by either or both partners to the planning, without interfering with the final optimum development of the water resource.

But Federal public works projects cannot be halted because someone argues—as Life magazine did—that what is non-Federal is wonderful but if it is Federal it is a wasteful pork barrel raid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief extract from the Life article, which is the basis of my comment.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

While the pork barrel rolls along distributing money by the billion, the States of Texas and Louisiana are trying out a unique experiment in homegrown economy. Both States have taken their shares of Federal pork in the past and may well do so in the future. But at Toledo Bend on the Sabine River that separates the States they are building a \$60 million dam with their own money.

An aura of healthy self-interest and anti-big-Government sentiment surrounds the project. "We retain local control and we are not contributing to larger and larger government," Simmons said recently. "I don't believe in this sitting back and waiting. Too often we have waited so long the Federal Government came in and filled a void that should have been handled by the States. It was our own fault."

In the end, creating a huge and economically viable addition to the productive facilities of their States, the people of Louisiana and Texas felt their breasts swelling with the pride of independence.

October 7

"Toledo Bend," said Louisiana Gov. Jimmie Davis at the ground breaking ceremony, "is a testimonial to the efficiency and workability of the principle of States' rights."

It also saved the people of the United States from another costly raid on their Treasury.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, sometimes I believe that these periodic attacks on Federal public works are beneficial. They remind those of us who realize the positive values of Federal public works investments that it is not enough to understand their worth, and their key role in economic growth, ourselves. They remind us that the good these great programs do must be told to the public, and told repeatedly, if the truth is to prevail over the sensationalism of detractors.

This has a special urgency for those of us from the Upper Missouri River basin, and indeed for all the Western States. Our economic future is tied to proposed large scale water, timber, recreation and highway programs, and particularly to the completion of water programs which are essential to agricultural, municipal and industrial growth.

In my own State, at the present stage of water resource development, tens of thousands of acres of our best agricultural lands have been inundated or committed to reservoirs without compensating reclamation of other lands. Uninformed attacks on the Federal public works programs, can defeat or delay construction at a critical midpoint for the whole upper Missouri Basin, leaving us with reduced rather than expanded economic opportunities and with a static economy, rather than the expansion which the next stages of development would bring.

Great dams to impound water have been constructed or are nearing completion. The next step is to make the water available for beneficial uses. The word "beneficial" is used thoughtfully for, as I shall show out of our past experience, water provided to agriculture in South Dakota expands crops now in short supply and livestock production, where increases in production are needed, and not the production of crops already in surplus.

First, however, I think we should re-examine American policy and experience in relation to Federal public works, and see if they have not had a great deal to do with the spectacular rise of our country from a primitive wilderness to the world's most productive nation in less than two centuries.

WASHINGTON SIGNED FIRST PUBLIC WORKS BILL; SURVEYED ROUTE TO THE WEST

If George Washington were alive today and active in public life, I have no doubt that some American journals would refer to him as the "father of the pork barrel" rather than the "Father of his Country."

The first Congress of the United States in August 1789 passed a law which made the establishment and maintenance of lighthouses, buoys, beacons, and public piers to assist navigation a Federal responsibility. President George Washington signed it on August 27, 1789. It became 1 Stat. 63—the 53d law of the new United States of America.

Discussion started at about the same time of a canal linking the Potomac River with the Ohio, to open up the new western territory for development. Shortly after he left the Presidency, Mr. Washington identified himself professionally with those who believed in Federal projects to speed the development of the Nation by surveying the route for a canal from Cumberland, Md., to the Ohio River near Wheeling, W. Va. A road instead of a canal was authorized on this route in 1806. It was constructed during one of the earliest congressional debates over Federal responsibility for internal improvements.

If Life magazine had been around at that time, it undoubtedly would have opposed these "pork barrel" projects—the road to the western territory as well as Federal assumption of responsibility for aids to navigation. There was opposition, but the road was completed in the 1830's to Vandalia, Ill., at a final total cost of \$7 million.

In this early 19th century period, Congress passed and President John Quincy Adams approved the first "omnibus" rivers and harbors bill and appropriated nearly \$2 million for the Chesapeake & Ohio, the Chesapeake & Delaware, the Louisville and Portland, and the Dismal Swamp canals.

In 1826 and 1827 the Corps of Engineers were allowed to make surveys for railroads under the General Surveys Act of 1824, although the act mentioned only roads and canals. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad got such assistance from 1827 to 1830. Other roads continued to receive such assistance until 1838, when it was discontinued for a decade. In the 10 years preceding the Civil War, the survey work was renewed and the Army Engineers were called upon for surveys of rail routes to the Pacific Ocean which ultimately became the basis for the construction of four transcontinental railroad lines.

Construction of the railroads was not direct Federal public works, with construction by Federal agencies. But so much of the original survey work and financing of the construction was Federal that they clearly have to be considered products of the Federal "pork barrel," if that term is to be attached to works projects supported by the U.S. Government.

A study by the Library of Congress shows that 130,401,606 acres of Federal public lands were granted to the railroads to help them finance construction. In addition, under the Pacific Railway Act of 1862, the Federal Government issued bonds to provide cash loans for railroad construction at the rate of \$16,000 per mile for level track, \$32,000 per mile for track in hilly areas, and \$48,000 per mile for track in mountainous terrain. The railroads repaid the principal and a part of the interest on these loans. A Board of Investigation and Research in 1945 fixed the Government's final cost of this financial aid to the railroads at \$74 billion.

There was opposition, of course, at the time these aids to the railroads were being voted, but no one can today deny that the speedy development of trans-

continental railroad transportation expedited development of the Nation and that the areas opened by the railroads have repaid the Federal investment a thousand times over.

The Federal Government has invested more than \$2.6 billion in the development of water transportation in the Nation dating back to the Act of 1789.

Since there is always the implied or direct charge made in connection with attacks on public works that such projects are ladled out on a basis of political favoritism, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record table, prepared by the Library of Congress, showing expenditures for navigation facilities by States since the inception of the program.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE III.—Ranking by States of construction appropriations through fiscal year 1960 for new work on existing navigation projects under civil works program of Corps of Engineers

	[Millions]
1. Illinois.....	\$214.1
2. Missouri.....	202.2
3. Michigan.....	193.2
4. New York.....	181.8
5. Ohio.....	141.5
6. Texas.....	120.7
7. California.....	120.5
8. Kentucky.....	115.9
9. Louisiana.....	115.6
10. Pennsylvania.....	104.5
11. West Virginia.....	99.6
12. Iowa.....	92.8
13. New Jersey.....	91.9
14. Florida.....	87.2
15. Alabama.....	83.4
16. Massachusetts.....	79.6
17. Minnesota.....	55.5
18. Nebraska.....	52.9
19. Virginia.....	49.8
20. Indiana.....	48.2
21. Washington.....	41.1
22. Arkansas.....	35.3
23. Oregon.....	34.9
24. Delaware.....	30.0
25. Kansas.....	29.5
26. North Carolina.....	24.4
27. Hawaii.....	24.1
28. Maryland.....	20.5
29. South Carolina.....	19.7
30. Alaska.....	14.5
31. Wisconsin.....	14.1
32. Connecticut.....	13.8
33. Maine.....	12.2
34. Georgia.....	12.0
35. Mississippi.....	8.9
36. Rhode Island.....	7.7
37. Tennessee.....	6.8
38. Oklahoma.....	6.6
39. District of Columbia.....	2.4
40. New Hampshire.....	1.3
41. Vermont.....	0.9
42. Idaho.....	0.2
43. Arizona.....	0.01
Total.....	2,611.8

No appropriations have been made for navigation projects in the States of Colorado, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

NOTE 1.—This tabulation is limited to appropriations for new work under existing projects specifically authorized by Congress. It excludes appropriations for superseded and abandoned projects.

NOTE 2.—In the table on "Multiple-purpose projects including power," total appropriations include about \$343 million allocable to the navigation function. Thus, of total appropriations of \$9,337.2 million for new work